APPLICANT ARGUMENTS OR REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are now in the application. Claims 1-2, 11-14 and 16-18 are amended. Claims 1, 11and 16 are independent claims.

Claim Objections

The Office Action objects to claims 11-20 because they are apparatus or device claims having no explicit connections of links between the components of the apparatus.

Applicants have amended claims 11-14 and 16-18 to include specific links between the components of the claimed apparatus.

Applicants, therefore, request that these objections be withdrawn and claims 11-20 be allowed.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 1-7 and 9-20 as obvious over Juitt et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0087629) in view of Allavarpu et al. (U.S. Patent 7,228,346).

Regarding independent claim 1, the Office Action allows that Juitt fails to specifically disclose applicants claim elements of "generating on said server, a notification for said user, said notification including a set of data selected from an application database by a process having encoded rule". However, the Office action continues and asserts that Allavarpu teaches these elements.

In particular, the Office Action asserts that the element "generating on said server, a notification for said user" is taught by Allavarpu at fig. 2 and in col. 11, lines 37-50.

Allavarpu discloses a Common Object Request Broker Architecture (COBRA) that can be used to manage networked objects such as printers, scanners, copiers and telephones that overcomes, for instance, access collision when multi-threaded applications attempt to use the objects. Part of the COBRA may be the CORBA Gateway shown in fig. 2. As described in, for instance, col. 7, lines 10-32, COBRA events are initiated or generated by a managed object. The events may include notifications, warnings or alarms, such as a printer running low on toner. The Event Gateway collects all incoming events and filters them to restrict the targets to which the event can be sent. The Event Gateway may convert the event or enqueue the event. The Event Gateway then dispatches the event to the client. The Event

Gateway is a server, but it does not generate notifications, it collects, filters and dispatches notifications.

In order to further clarify this distinction and to more clearly distinguish applicant's invention from the prior art, applicant has amended claim 1 to read, in relevant part:

"...generating, <u>by a run-time component</u> on said server, a notification for said user, ..."

Independent claims 11 and 16 have similar language.

The Office Action further alleges that applicants' claim 1 element of "said notification including a set of data selected from an application database having encoded rules" is taught by Allavarpu at col. 11, line 63- col. 12, line 10 and in fig. 3 (Event distribution server and EventPortRegistry Server.

In the embodiment discussed at those points in the application, the events are being filtered to ensure policy based access control. The system is determining which events can be passed on to which COBRA clients. As detailed above, the COBRA events are typically notifications, warnings or alarms, such as a printer running low on toner. Applicants notifications are, in contrast, are typically text messages or URLs.

In order to further clarify this distinction and to more clearly distinguish applicant's invention from the prior art, applicant has amended claim 1 to read, in relevant part:

"said notification including a set of <u>document related</u> data selected from an application database by a process having encoded rules <u>including a document-field related rule for an includable data type</u>"

Independent claims 11 and 16 have similar language.

The Office Action further alleges that applicants' claim 1 element of "transmitting said notification to said user via said client device" is taught by Allavaru in fig. 1a. Although fig. 1a shows a box labeled client that is part of a TMN Manager Software that is connected to a network, applicants respectfully submit there are no notifications shown in fig. 1a, nor are there any users shown in fig. 1a and there is, therefore, nothing in fig. 1a to suggest "transmitting said notification to said user via said client device".

Independent claims 11 and 16 have similar language.

As the Office Action does not show how Allavarpu and Juitt disclose or suggest all the elements of applicants independent claims 1, 11 and 16, the Office Action does not show how they make applicants' claimed invention obvious. Applicants, therefore, request that this rejection be withdrawn and that claims 1, 11 and 16 be allowed.

Applicant submits that claims 2-10, 12-15 and 17 -20 each depend from, and include all the limitations of, a now allowable independent claim. Applicant therefore requests that these claims, as amended, now be allowed.

Summary

Therefore in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments, favorable reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of all rejections and objections and that claims 1-20 be allowed at an early date and the patent allowed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Gus Rashid et al.

By   /Roy J. Rosser/

Roy J. Rosser
Agent for Applicant
Reg. No. 53,533

Synnestvedt & Lechner LLP
P. O. Box 592
Princeton, NJ 08542-0592
Tel. (609) 924-3773
Fax (609) 924-1811